



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,019	07/25/2003	Bhavna Bhatnagar	03226/503001; P8951	3673
32615	7590	04/13/2009		
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN TWO HOUSTON CENTER 909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500 HOUSTON, TX 77010			EXAMINER LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
			ART UNIT 2432	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/13/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
lord@oshaliang.com
hathaway@oshaliang.com

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant argues, “a request for a resource is not a request for authentication.” This argument is not persuasive because the result of the request made by the user in Blakley is authentication. Therefore, the request of Blakley can be considered an authentication request as claimed.
2. Applicant argues, “Because the authentication assertion is transferred to a relying domain by the issuing domain, and therefore *not* provided to the client in response of the first authentication request, Applicant’s assert that Blakley also fails to disclose limitation (ii).” This argument is not persuasive because the claims do not require the client to receive the assertion. Instead, the claims merely require the assertion to be received from the first server, and sent to the second server. Therefore, even *if* the assertion in Blakley is merely sent from the issuing domain to the relying domain direct, the claims limitations would be met.
3. Applicant argues, “Blakley does not disclose the use of a certificate associated with the second server.” This argument is not persuasive because the claims do not define the depth of the claimed "association". The fact that relying server is included within the authentication scheme that utilizes the certification would meet the claimed “association”. The claims do not require content specific to the claimed second server to be included within the certificate.
4. Applicant argues, “Blakley does not disclose a trusted partner list.” This argument is not persuasive because Blakley discloses that the issuing domain checks to see if the credential are maintained and passes a validation answer to the relying domain ([0171]-[0172]). Examiner

Art Unit: 2432

would like to point out that "trusted partner list" is not a term of art, and therefore the limitations have been met using a broad but reasonable interpretation of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 37-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blakley, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0128392. Referring to claims 37, 41, 45, 46, Blakley discloses single sign-on operations for a user at multiple domains wherein the user sends a request to an issuing domain and receives an assertion from the issuing domain (Figure 3C & [0138]), which meets the limitation of sending a first authentication request to a first server, receiving, in response to the first authentication request, an authentication assertion reference from the first server, the client is authenticated by the second server prior to obtaining the authentication assertion reference. The assertion is forwarded to a relying domain (Figures 3C & Figure 5 & [0139] & [0169]), which meets the limitation of sending, to a second server, a request to access the resource operatively connected to the second server, wherein the request comprises the authentication assertion reference. The relying domain receives credentials, that can be in certificate form, from the user and then forwards the credentials to the issuing domain (Figure 5 & [0070] & [0170]-[0171]), which meets the limitation of wherein, in response to the request, the second server sends the first server a second authentication request comprising a certificate

Art Unit: 2432

associated with the second server. The issuing domain checks to see if the credential are maintained and passes a validation answer to the relying domain ([0171]-[0172]), which meets the limitation of wherein the first server, in response to the second authentication request, determines whether the certificate is present in a trusted partner list maintained by the first server, and wherein the first server, in response to determining whether the certificate is present in the trusted partner list, sends an authentication assertion to the second server. Based on the received assertion, the relying domain authorizes the requesting user to access ([0173]), which meets the limitation of receiving a grant of access to the resource from the second server, wherein the second server grants access to the resource based on the authentication assertion.

Referring to claims 38, 42, 49, Blakley discloses prior to sending the first server the second authentication request, the second server identifies the first server using the authentication assertion reference (Figure 5 & [0170]).

Referring to claims 39, 43, 47, Blakley discloses that the first authentication request includes login information ([0048]), which meets the limitation of sending a first authentication request to the first server comprises providing the first server with user login information.

Referring to claims 40, 44, 48, Blakley discloses the first authentication request is a Security Assertion Markup Language request in a SOAP envelope ([0092]-[0093]).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2432

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN E. LANIER whose telephone number is (571)272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin E Lanier/

Application/Control Number: 10/627,019

Page 6

Art Unit: 2432

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432